

8th October 1928]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ May I know if it is in contemplation to see that the cost of working the Act is debited to Provincial revenues either in whole or in part ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ That matter is under the consideration of Government.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ May I know with regard to one part of clause (d), when the Government propose to bring in the Bill ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ The Bill is now being examined by the Law Department, and as soon as that examination is over, I hope to place it before the very committee which considered the Bill when my hon. Friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, was in charge, and when that course is done and when the Bill is finally drafted and ready, I hope to introduce it in the Council.”

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya :—“ May I know from the hon. Minister in charge of Religious Endowments how long it will take to bring in the amending Bill ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ I cannot exactly say what time it will take ”

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya :—“ Roughly ? ”

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ May I know if the removal of the Kanyakaparameswari temples from the operation of the Act will be one of the questions that will be considered in this amending Bill ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ I do not think so, Sir.”

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—“ Why not, Sir ? ”

Excise

Location of arrack shops in certain villages in Tiruvallur taluk.

* 388 Q.—Mr. P. BHAKTAVATSULU NAYUDU : Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any rule that toddy or arrack shops should not be located within a distance of four to five miles from one another ;

(b) whether it is a fact that toddy shops in the villages of Perathur, Z. 77, Tirukanancheri, V. N. 114, Valliyur, V. N. 109, Meyur, V. N. 113, Kathervedu, V. N. 105, Vengal, Z. 107, in Tiruvallur taluk, Chingleput district, are located within a distance of one or two miles from each other ;

(c) whether it is a fact that arrack shops in the villages of Valliyur, Garaganpundi, Kilanur and Meyur, in Tiruvallur taluk, Chingleput district, are located within a distance of about a mile or so from each other ;

(d) whether it is a fact that there is a toddy shop in the village of Thirukananjeri (114), consisting of 41 houses with a total population of only 292 persons ;

(e) whether it is a fact that there is an arrack shop in the village of Garaganpundi (112) in Tiruvallur taluk, Chingleput district, consisting of 22 houses with a total population of only 106 persons ; and

(f) if the answers to (a) and (b) are in the affirmative, why the rule has been disregarded in the instances mentioned above ?

[8th October 1928]

A.—(a) The hon. Member presumably refers to the rule that rural shops must not be located without the special permission of the Collector within a furlong of a metalled road and that the minimum distance between shops on a road side in rural areas should ordinarily be five miles.

(b) to (f) The Government have no information. A report has been called for.

Mr. P. BHAKTAVATSULU NAYUDU :—“ The answer says that the minimum distance between shops on a road side in rural areas should ordinarily be five miles. What is the distance the Government consider necessary in extraordinary cases like this, Sir ? ”

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ No extraordinary cases have so far arisen to my knowledge. It is that these should be located at distances of 5 miles from each other. If it is less than that, the matter will have to be examined. With reference to clauses (b) to (f) I have already stated that the Government have no information and that a report has been called for. If that information is received, we will examine the question in the light of that.”

Medical

Amendment of the rules for the admission and training of L.M.P. candidates.

* 389 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether rule 33 (c) of the rules for admission and training of pupils for the Diploma of Licensed Medical Practitioner was amended last year;

(b) whether the amendment gives full discretion to the Board of Examiners to remand any candidate, even though he has obtained the required number of marks in the Board Examination, if after a scrutiny of the results of class examination they consider such a course necessary;

(c) whether this new rule was given effect to in the last April examination;

(d) if so, how many candidates who got the required percentage of marks in that examination were remanded as the result of this new rule;

(e) whether the President of the Board of Examiners protested against the unfairness of this new amendment at the time it was made; and

(f) whether the Government propose to withdraw the new amendment or at least to modify it so as to give power to the Board to pass or fail students on the basis of their school record?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes.

(d) Fifteen candidates; eleven in the first year class, one in the second year, two in the third year and one in the final year.

(e) Yes.

(f) The matter is under the consideration of the Government.